



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,692	01/03/2006	Hiroaki Koyama	CSP-114-A	2670
21828	7590	03/07/2008	EXAMINER	
CARRIER BLACKMAN AND ASSOCIATES			KERNNS, KEVIN P	
24101 NOVI ROAD				
SUITE 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NOVI, MI 48375			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/07/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

cbalaw@gmail.com  
cbalaw@ameritech.net  
wblackman@ameritech.net

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/532,692	KOYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin P. Kerns	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-6,9 and 12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-6,9 and 12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvath (US 2,495,064) in view of Scruggs et al. (US 5,711,363).

Horvath discloses a casting die capable of casting molten metal, in which the casting die comprises a main body (10,16) and a cavity forming member (19,20), with the cavity forming member (19,20) having a wall to serve as a portion of the mold cavity (see Figure 1). The main body is made of steel (column 3, line 39). The mold cavity of Figure 1 is curved from the gate for receiving molten metal, and the cavity forming

member (19,20) is disposed closest to the gate (Figure 1). Furthermore, Horvath discloses that the cavity forming member (19,20) is soldered onto main body (16,17). Horvath discloses the claimed invention above, but lacks the cavity forming member being made of steel, and that the cavity forming member is welded to the main body.

However, Scruggs et al. disclose "it is preferred that the die-casting mold 32, and especially the portion of the mold that forms the internal molding surface 38, be made of a steel that is highly resistant to heat checking, such as H-11 or H-13 tool steels or maraging steel" (column 4, lines 13-29), for the purpose of preventing internal cracking to the interior of the mold upon contacting with molten metal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to replace the carbide inserts (19,20) of Horvath with the maraging steel of Scruggs et al., in order to provide better heat resistance to the molten metal, since it is disposed close to the gate (Scruggs et al.; column 4, lines 13-29). Furthermore, Horvath discloses the cavity forming member (19,20) fused to main body (16,17) by soldering and not welding. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to either solder or weld both components together, depending on the design expediency. In addition, both methods are functionally equivalent.

***Response to Arguments***

4. The examiner acknowledges the applicants' amendment provided with the request for continued examination received by the USPTO on December 27, 2007. The applicants have cancelled claims 3, 7, 8, 10, and 11. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, and 12 are currently under consideration in the application.
  
5. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-6, 9, and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kevin P. Kerns whose telephone number is (571)272-1178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin P. Kerns  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1793

/Kevin P. Kerns/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793  
February 20, 2008